REMARKS

Claims 1-19 were pending in the application. By this paper, Claims 5-10 and 15-16 are cancelled without prejudice, Claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 17, 18, and 19 amended, and new Claims 20-42 added. Hence, Claims 1-4, 11-14, 17-19, and 20-42 are now pending in the application.

Amendments to the Drawings

Pursuant to Par. 1 of the Office Action, Applicant herewith submits proposed amendments to Figs. 3, 4, and 5 as filed for consideration by the Examiner. These multipart Figures now each have an ascending number as requested by the Examiner (e.g., Fig. 3-1, Fig. 3-2, and so forth). Applicant submits that these proposed changes overcome the Examiner's objections.

Amendments to the Specification

Pursuant to Par. 3 of the Office Action, Applicant has herein amended the specification on page 9, lines 14-23 in order to more clearly point out this aspect of the invention. Support for this amendment is explicitly presented on, *inter alia*, Page 26, lines 48-50 (Appendix I) as filed, wherein the now-described functionality is clearly stated.

Section 112 Rejections

Applicant's cancellation of Claims 5-10 herein renders the Examiner's Section 112 rejections (Pars. 2-5 of the Office Action) moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Per Pars. 6-10 of the Office Action, Claims 3, 5, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Shapiro (U.S. 4,899,128), Kernighan ("The Practice of Programming"), and Baird (U.S. 5,848,264), respectively. Applicant's cancellation of Claim 5 herein renders rejection of this claim moot.

Claim 3 - With respect to Claims 3, Applicant has herein amended this claim to include limitations relating to the recited act of identifying comprising: identifying groups of data within the strings that are identical across the plurality of input strings; and identifying groups of the

data within the strings that appear in the same order within all of the strings. Applicant submits that none of the cited art (including Shapiro) teach or suggest such functionality in combination with the other limitations of Claim 3.

Claim 19 - With respect to Claims 3, Applicant has herein amended this claim to include limitations relating to the recited debug process identifies the recited similarities and differences by: identifying groups of data within the first and second strings that are identical across at least both of the strings; and identifying groups of the data within said first and second strings that appear in the same order within at least both of the strings. Applicant submits that none of the cited art (including Baird) teach or suggest such functionality in combination with the other limitations of Claim 19.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

1.   Per Pars. 11-12 of the Office Action, Claims 1 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kernighan ("The Practice of Programming") in view of Baird (U.S. 5,848,264). Applicant's cancellation of Claims 15-16 herein renders these rejections moot.

Claim 1 - With respect to Claim 1, Applicant has herein amended this claim to include limitations relating to the recited act of identifying comprises: identifying groups of data within the strings that are identical across the plurality of input strings; and identifying groups of the data within the strings that appear in the same order within all of the strings. Applicant submits that none of the cited art (including Kernighan or Baird) teach or suggest such functionality in combination with the other limitations of Claim 1.

Claim 17 - With respect to Claim 17, Applicant has herein amended this claim to include limitations relating to generating a <u>third</u> data string using a third of the plurality of software processes; inputting the first, second and third data strings into a debug software process; analyzing the first, second and third data strings using the debug process; and evaluating the operation of the processes based at least in part on the analysis. Applicant submits that none of

the cited art (including Kernighan or Baird) teach or suggest such functionality in combination with the other limitations of Claim 17. Kernighan teaches at best analysis of two data strings.

Claim 18 - Claim 18 depends on Claim 17 (previously discussed), and hence is therefore allowable as well.

2.   Per Par. 13 of the Office Action, Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kernighan ("The Practice of Programming") in view of Baird (U.S. 5,848,264) and Aho ("Compilers Principles, Techniques and Tools.").

Claim 2 - Claim 2 depends on Claim 1 (previously discussed), and hence is therefore allowable as well.

3.   Per Par. 14 of the Office Action, Claims 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Shapiro in view of Aho ("Compilers Principles, Techniques and Tools.").

Claims 11 and 12 - With respect to Claims 11 and 12, Applicant has herein amended these claims to include limitations relating to the recited act of identifying comprises: identifying groups of data within the strings that are identical across the plurality of input strings; and identifying groups of the data within the strings that appear in the same order within all of the strings. Applicant submits that none of the cited art (including Shapiro or Aho) teach or suggest such functionality in combination with the other limitations of each of Claims 11 and 12.

4.   Per Par. 15 of the Office Action, Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Kernighan in view of Aho ("Compilers Principles, Techniques and Tools."). By this paper, Applicant has cancelled Claim 9 without prejudice, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

5.   Per Par. 16 of the Office Action, Claims 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Shapiro in view of Aho and Baird.

Claims 13 and 14 - Claims 13 and 14 depend directly or indirectly on Claim 12 (previously discussed), and hence is therefore allowable as well.

New Claims

By this paper, Applicant has added new Claims 20-42. Support for these new claims is replete throughout the specification as filed (see, *inter alia*, the Example described on pages 13-18 of the specification, as well as the exemplary computer code of Appendix I). Applicant submits that these new claims each distinguish over the art of record as well, and hence are in condition for allowance.

Other Remarks

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-4, 11-14, and 17-42 define patentable subject matter, and are in condition for allowance.

Applicant hereby specifically reserves the right to prosecute claims of different or broader scope in a continuation or divisional application.

Applicant notes that any cancellations or additions made herein are made solely for the purposes of more clearly and particularly describing and claiming the invention, and not for purposes of overcoming art or for patentability. The Examiner should infer no (i) adoption of a position with respect to patentability, (ii) change in the Applicant's position with respect to any claim or subject matter of the invention, or (iii) acquiescence in any way to any position taken by the Examiner, based on such cancellations or additions.

Furthermore, any remarks made with respect to a give claim or claims are limited to only such claim or claims.

Appl. No.   :   09/805,423
Filed   :   March 13, 2001

If the Examiner has any questions or comments which may be resolved over the telephone, he is requested to call the undersigned at (858) 675-1670.

Respectfully submitted,

GAZDZINSKI & ASSOCIATES

Dated: November _8_, 2004   By: _____

Robert F. Gazdzinski
Registration No. 39,990
11440 West Bernardo Court, Suite 375
San Diego, CA 92127
(858) 675-1670
(858) 675-1674 (fax)